

Littlewood–Paley–Rubio de Francia inequality in Morrey–Campanato spaces

Nikolay N. Osipov*

November 6, 2012

St. Petersburg Department of Steklov Mathematical Institute RAS,
Fontanka 27, St. Petersburg, Russia

Chebyshev Laboratory (SPbU), 14th Line 29B, Vasilyevsky Island,
St. Petersburg, Russia

nicknick@pdmi.ras.ru

Abstract

Rubio de Francia proved the one-sided Littlewood–Paley inequality for arbitrary intervals in L^p , $2 \leq p < \infty$. In this article, his methods are developed and employed to prove an analogue of such an inequality in $(H^p)^*$, $0 < p \leq 1$. The spaces $(H^p)^*$ coincide with the so-called Morrey–Campanato spaces. It turns out that some of these spaces are well-known classes: BMO, the Hölder and Lipschitz spaces, etc.

1 History and results

Let $\{\Delta_m\}$ be a finite or countable collection of mutually disjoint intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. By M_{Δ_m} we denote the operators corresponding to the multipliers χ_{Δ_m} : $M_{\Delta_m}f = (\widehat{f}\chi_{\Delta_m})^\vee$. In 1983, Rubio de Francia (see [5]) proved that

$$\left\| \left(\sum_m |M_{\Delta_m}f|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_p \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad 2 \leq p < \infty, \quad (1)$$

where the constant C_p does not depend on f or $\{\Delta_m\}$. By duality, this estimate is equivalent to the following one:

$$\left\| \sum_m f_m \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_p \left\| \left(\sum_m |f_m|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}, \quad 1 < p \leq 2, \quad (2)$$

*The author is supported by Chebyshev Laboratory of SPbU (RF Government grant no. 11.G34.31.0026), by RFBR (grant no. 11-01-00526), and by Rokhlin grant.

where $\{f_m\}$ is a sequence of functions such that $\text{supp } \widehat{f}_m \subset \Delta_m$. In 1984, Bourgain (see [1]) proved that estimate (2) remains true for $p = 1$. His method was more complicated than Rubio de Francia's arguments. But in 2005, Kislyakov and Parilov employed a technique similar to Rubio de Francia's method and established (see [4]) that estimate (2) is fulfilled for all $0 < p \leq 2$. They used the theory of Calderón–Zygmund operators on Hardy spaces H^p . The question naturally arises: is any analogue of estimate (1) fulfilled for the spaces dual to the classes H^p (here we refer to the “real” Hardy classes, which are described, for example, in [6])?

In [2, 4, 5], the authors studied, in fact, operators (or their duals) of the following form:

$$S^1 f(x) = \left\{ e^{-2\pi i a_m x} M_{\Delta_m} f(x) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad S^2 f(x) = \left\{ e^{-2\pi i b_m x} M_{\Delta_m} f(x) \right\},$$

where a_m and b_m are the left and right ends of Δ_m respectively. It turns out that these operators are not bounded on the spaces dual to H^p . We show this for the space $\text{BMO} = (H^1)^*$. Suppose

$$\|M_{[0,\eta]}(f)\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C\|f\|_{\text{BMO}},$$

where $f \in L^2 \cap \text{BMO}$ and C does not depend on f or η . Consider some function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\varphi \equiv 1$ on $[1, 2]$ and $\varphi \equiv 0$ outside $[0, 3]$. Then the operators corresponding to the Fourier multipliers $\varphi(\eta\xi)$, $\eta > 0$, are uniformly bounded from L^1 to H^1 and, therefore, from BMO to L^∞ . But this means that $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}} \asymp \|f\|_{L^\infty}$, provided $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset [\eta, 2\eta]$. On the other hand, if we put $\Delta = [0, \frac{3}{2}\eta]$, then $\|M_\Delta f\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C\|f\|_{\text{BMO}}$ by our assumption. If $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset [\eta, 2\eta]$, this implies that $\|M_\Delta f\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|f\|_{L^\infty}$. But therefore, the Riesz projection (the antianalytic one) is uniformly bounded in L^∞ on all the functions such that their Fourier transforms have compact supports. This is a contradiction.

However, after a slight modification, the operators S^1 and S^2 become bounded on $(H^p)^*$. It is only necessary to smooth each multiplier χ_{Δ_m} at one of the ends of Δ_m .

First, we need to discuss the spaces $(H^p)^*$ that are determined by the Morrey–Campanato norms.

Preliminaries: the Morrey–Campanato spaces. Let $\mathcal{P}_i$ be the space of algebraic polynomials of degree strictly less than i . We agree that $\mathcal{P}_0 = \{0\}$. For l^2 -valued polynomials, we use the notation $\mathcal{P}_i(l^2)$. Now we give the definition of the Morrey–Campanato spaces $\dot{C}_p^{s,i}$.

Definition 1. Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $s \in (-n/p, i]$. Suppose f is a locally integrable function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (scalar-valued or l^2 -valued). Then we say that $f \in \dot{C}_p^{s,i}$ if

$$\|f\|_{i,p,s} = \sup_Q \inf_P \frac{1}{|Q|^{s/n}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f - P|^p \right)^{1/p} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all the cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the infimum is taken over all the polynomials in $\mathcal{P}_i$ or $\mathcal{P}_i(l^2)$.

The John–Nirenberg inequality implies that $\text{BMO} = \dot{C}_p^{0,1}$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$ (in the sense that the norms are equivalent). Moreover, we can state the following proposition.

Lemma 1. *If $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < s \leq i$, then $\dot{C}_p^{s,i}$ does not depend on p , $1 \leq p < \infty$.*

The proof can be found in Section 1.1.2 of [3]. Also the following lemma was proved.

Lemma 2. *If $0 < s \leq 1$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, then the space $\dot{C}_p^{s,1}$ coincides with the Lipschitz class Lip_s that is determined by the seminorm*

$$\|f\|_{\text{Lip}_s} = \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^s}.$$

It turns out, that all the Campanato spaces (the spaces $\dot{C}_p^{s,i}$ for $s > 0$) can be renormed in a similar way. Namely, for a function f on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the differences $\Delta_h^\alpha f$ by the recurrent formulas

$$\Delta_h^1 f(x) = f(x + h) - f(x), \quad \Delta_h^\alpha f(x) = \Delta_h^1 \Delta_h^{\alpha-1} f(x), \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then we can state the following proposition.

Lemma 3. *Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $0 < s \leq i$. Then for the space $\dot{C}_p^{s,i}$, we can choose $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\dot{C}_p^{s,i}$ coincides with the class of locally integrable functions satisfying*

$$|\Delta_h^\alpha f(x)| \leq C|h|^s,$$

where C does not depend on x or h . The infimum of such C provides an equivalent seminorm on $\dot{C}_p^{s,i}$.

For example, the spaces $\dot{C}_p^{1,2}$ coincide with the so-called Zygmund class Z that is determined by the condition $|\Delta_h^2 f(x)| \leq C|h|$. Details can be found in Section 4.1.1 of [3].

Preliminaries: the maximal functions. Here we introduce the maximal functions corresponding to the Morrey–Campanato norms.

Definition 2. Suppose $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $h = \{h_m\}$ be a collection (finite or countable) of measurable functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We define the maximal function $M_{i,p,s}h$ by the formula

$$M_{i,p,s}h(x) = \sup_{Q \ni x} \inf_P \frac{1}{|Q|^{s/n}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |h - P|_{l^2}^p \right)^{1/p},$$

where the supremum is taken over all the cubes containing x and the infimum is taken over all the collections $P = \{P_m\}$ of polynomials $P_m \in \mathcal{P}_i$.

Remark 1. Let $h = \{h_m\}$ be a countable collection of measurable functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $M_{i,p,s}h(x_0) < \infty$ at some point x_0 . Then there exist a collections $P = \{P_m\}$ of polynomials $P_m \in \mathcal{P}_i$ such that $h - P \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^n, l^2)$.

Proof. Consider some cube Q_1 containing x_0 . By Definition 2, we can choose a collection P_1 of polynomials such that $h - P_1 \in L^p(Q_1, l^2)$. Also, consider another cube Q_2 , $Q_2 \supset Q_1$, and a corresponding collection P_2 such that $h - P_2 \in L^p(Q_2, l^2)$. We have

$$P_2 - P_1 = (h - P_1) - (h - P_2) \in L^p(Q_1, l^2).$$

Thus, $P_2 - P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_i(l^2)$ and

$$h - P_1 = (h - P_2) + (P_2 - P_1) \in L^p(Q_2, l^2).$$

Therefore, we may set $P = P_1$. □

Lemma 4. Suppose $1 \leq p < \infty$. Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ be parameters such that $i \geq s$. Suppose β is a positive number and, besides, $\beta > \max\{s, i - 1\}$. Consider a measurable function f (scalar-valued or l^2 -valued) on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $M_{i,p,s}f$ is finite at least at one point. Then the function

$$|f(x)|(1 + |x|^{n+\beta})^{-1}$$

is integrable.

This lemma was implicitly prove in Section 4.4.1 of [3].

Also we need a certain modification of $M_{i,p,s}f$. In [3], the authors introduce projections $\mathfrak{P}_Q$ that act from $L^p(Q; \frac{dx}{|Q|})$ onto $\mathcal{P}_i$ and allow us to choose polynomials at which the infimums in the definition of $M_{i,p,s}f$ are attained

roughly. Namely, for a scalar-valued or l^2 -valued function $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the function $M_{i,p,s}f$ is equivalent to the following expression:

$$\widetilde{M}_{i,p,s}f(x) = \sup_Q \frac{1}{|Q|^{s/n}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f - \mathfrak{P}_Q f|^p \right)^{1/p}, \quad (3)$$

where the supremum is taken over all the cubes centered at x . Details can be found in Sections 1.2.2 and 4.4.1 of [3].

The main result and corollaries. First, we state a preliminary version of the main result. Namely, in order to avoid complications with definition of Fourier multipliers, we additionally assume $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Delta_m = [a_m, b_m]$ be pairwise disjoint intervals on $\mathbb{R}$ with lengths $l_m = b_m - a_m$. Here the index m runs over some finite or countable set $\mathcal{M}$. Suppose $0 \notin (a_m, b_m)$ for any $m \in \mathcal{M}$. Consider two functions ψ^1 and ψ^2 in $C^\infty([0, 1])$ such that*

$$\text{supp } \psi^1 \subset [0, \tfrac{2}{3}], \quad \text{supp } \psi^2 \subset [\tfrac{1}{3}, 1],$$

$$\psi^1 + \psi^2 \equiv 1 \quad \text{on} \quad [0, 1].$$

We extend the functions ψ^σ , $\sigma = 1, 2$, on the whole line by zero and introduce their transformations supported on Δ_m :

$$\psi_m^\sigma(\xi) = \psi^\sigma\left(\frac{\xi - a_m}{l_m}\right).$$

Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. We define two linear operators S^σ by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} S^1 f(x) &= \left\{ e^{-2\pi i a_m x} (\widehat{f} \psi_m^1)^\vee(x) \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \\ S^2 f(x) &= \left\{ e^{-2\pi i b_m x} (\widehat{f} \psi_m^2)^\vee(x) \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Then we have

$$M_{r,2,s}(S^\sigma f) \leq C M_{i,2,s}f,$$

provided $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \geq s$, and $r > \max\{s, i-1\}$.¹ The constant C does not depend on f or $\{\Delta_m\}$.

¹From now on, the letters s , i , and r always denote parameters for which such relations are fulfilled, unless otherwise stated.

Suppose f is a function such that $M_{i,p,s}f$ is finite at some point, and φ is a function in $\mathcal{S}$. Then Lemma 4 immediately implies the following: the Fourier transform of f is well defined, $f * \varphi \in C^\infty$, $f * \varphi \in \mathcal{S}'$, and $\widehat{f * \varphi} = \widehat{f} \widehat{\varphi}$. This allows us to state the final version of the main result where we lift the restriction $f \in L^2$.

Theorem 2. *Let Δ_m and ψ_m^σ , $\sigma = 1, 2$, be the intervals and the functions introduced in Theorem 1. Suppose f is a measurable function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $M_{i,2,s}f$ is finite at some point. Then for each m , there exist two sequences of functions $\psi_{m,\nu}^\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ (their choice does not depend on f) and two sequences of polynomials $p_{m,\nu}^\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_r$ (depending on f) such that*

- 1) *the sequences $\psi_{m,\nu}^\sigma$ converge to the functions ψ_m^σ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$;*
- 2) *there exist two functions $g^\sigma = \{g_m^\sigma\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, l^2)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ e^{-2\pi i a_m x} (\widehat{f} \psi_{m,\nu}^1)^\vee(x) - p_{m,\nu}^1(x) \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}} &\rightarrow g^1, \\ \left\{ e^{-2\pi i b_m x} (\widehat{f} \psi_{m,\nu}^2)^\vee(x) - p_{m,\nu}^2(x) \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}} &\rightarrow g^2 \end{aligned}$$

as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$, where the limits can be taken in $L^2(I, l^2)$ for any interval I .

- 3) *putting*

$$\widetilde{S}^\sigma f = g^\sigma,$$

we have

$$M_{r,2,s}(\widetilde{S}^\sigma f) \leq C M_{i,2,s}f,$$

where the constant C does not depend on f or $\{\Delta_m\}$.

It is not hard to see, that Theorem 2 immediately implies Theorem 1.

The local estimates for the maximal functions yield the corresponding norm estimates.

Corollary 1. *Besides our usual requirements on s , i , and r (see Theorem 1), we suppose $s \in (-1/2, i]$. Then for $f \in \dot{C}_2^{s,i}(\mathbb{R})$, we have*

$$\|\widetilde{S}^\sigma f\|_{r,2,s} \leq C \|f\|_{i,2,s}, \quad \sigma = 1, 2,$$

where the constant C does not depend on f or $\{\Delta_m\}$.

In its turn, this proposition implies that the operators $\widetilde{S}^\sigma$ are bounded from BMO to BMO, from Lip_s to Lip_s for $0 < s < 1$, from Lip_1 to Z , and from Z to Z .

2 Decomposition of S^σ

We prove Theorem 2 for the multipliers ψ_m^1 only. The proof of the other half is symmetric.

First, we introduce some objects that are required for our proof. Let $A, A > 1$, be a number sufficiently close to 1. We choose a function θ such that $\text{supp } \widehat{\theta} \subset [A^{-1}, A]$ and

$$\sum_{v \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\theta}(\xi/A^v) \equiv 1$$

on $(0, +\infty)$. By θ_v we denote the functions such that $\widehat{\theta}_v(\xi) = \widehat{\theta}(\xi/A^v)$, i.e. $\theta_v(t) = A^v \theta(A^v t)$, and by A_v we denote the intervals $[A^{v-1}, A^{v+1}]$. Note that $\text{supp } \widehat{\theta}_v \subset A_v$

Using the partition of unity introduced above, we build the sequence $\psi_{m,\nu}^1$. For each m , we consider the intervals A_v that intersect with $[0, \frac{2}{3}l_m]$ and denote the index of the rightmost interval by N_m . Then we set

$$\psi_{m,\nu}^1(\xi) = \psi_m^1(\xi) \sum_{v=\nu}^{N_m} \widehat{\theta}_v(\xi - a_m), \quad \nu = -\infty \dots N_m.$$

It is clear that $\psi_{m,\nu}^1 \rightarrow \psi_m^1$ in L^2 as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$.

Further, we consider the intervals

$$J_{k,j} = [j2^k, (j+8)2^k], \quad k, j \in \mathbb{Z},$$

which can be obtained from the dyadic ones by 8-fold dilation with preservation of the left ends. It turns out that any interval in $\mathbb{R}$ can, in some sense, be approximated by a certain interval $J_{k,j}$ of the type described above. Namely, we can prove the following simple fact.

Remark 2. For any interval $\Delta = [a, b]$, there exist indices $k, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\Delta \subset \frac{3}{4}J_{k,j}$ and $|\Delta| \asymp |J_{k,j}|$.

Proof. Choose index k such that $2^k \leq |\Delta| < 2^{k+1}$, and set

$$j = \sup \{j \in \mathbb{Z} \mid (j+1)2^k < a\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that the interval $J_{k,j}$ is required. $\square$

Thus, for each m and v , we can choose indices $k_{m,v}$ and $j_{m,v}$ such that

$$a_m + A_v \subset \frac{3}{4}J_{k_{m,v}, j_{m,v}}$$

and the lengths of this intervals are equivalent. By $a_{m,v}$ we denote the left ends of $J_{k_{m,v}, j_{m,v}}$, i.e., we set $a_{m,v} = j_{m,v}2^{k_{m,v}}$.

Next, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we build a function ϕ_k such that

$$\text{supp } \widehat{\phi}_k \subset J_{k,0} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\phi}_k \equiv 1 \quad \text{on} \quad \frac{3}{4}J_{k,0}.$$

Namely, let ϕ be a function in $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\text{supp } \widehat{\phi} \subset [0, 8]$ and $\widehat{\phi} \equiv 1$ on $[1, 7]$. Then we set $\phi_k(t) = 2^k \phi(2^k t)$.

Also, we need some smooth extension of ψ^1 . Namely, let $\tilde{\psi}$ be a function in $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\tilde{\psi} \equiv \psi^1$ on $[0, 1]$. Besides, we introduce the functions $\varphi_m(t) = l_m \tilde{\psi}^\vee(l_m t)$. Note that $\widehat{\varphi}_m(\xi) = \psi_m^1(\xi + a_m)$ on $[0, l_m]$ for each m .

Finally, we set $\delta_{m,v} = a_{m,v} - a_m$ and

$$g_{m,v}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_{k_{m,v}}(t - y) e^{-2\pi i a_{m,v} y} f(y) dy. \quad (5)$$

Using all the objects introduced above, we can write the following identity:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-2\pi i a_m x} (\widehat{f} \psi_{m,\nu})^\vee(x) \\ = \sum_{v=\nu}^{N_m} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i \delta_{m,v} \tau} \theta_v(x - \tau) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i \delta_{m,v}(\tau - t)} \varphi_m(\tau - t) g_{m,v}(t) dt d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

To verify this relation, it is sufficient to compare the Fourier transforms of its left and right parts. Denoting $e^{2\pi i \delta_{m,v} \tau} \theta_v(x - \tau)$ by $\rho_{m,v}(x, \tau)$ and $e^{-2\pi i \delta_{m,v} t} \varphi_m(t)$ by $\Phi_{m,v}(t)$, we have

$$e^{-2\pi i a_m x} (\widehat{f} \psi_{m,\nu})^\vee(x) = \sum_{v=\nu}^{N_m} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_{m,v}(x, \tau) (\Phi_{m,v} * g_{m,v})(\tau) d\tau \quad (6)$$

3 The merging operator R

First, we study the operator R that transforms a double sequence of functions to an unary sequence by the formula

$$R(\{h_{m,v}\})(x) = \left\{ \sum_{v=-\infty}^{N_m} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_{m,v}(x, \tau) h_{m,v}(\tau) d\tau \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}.$$

Remark 3. The operator R is L^2 -bounded.

Proof. This follows immediately from the Plancherel theorem and the fact that each set $\text{supp } \widehat{\theta}_v$ can intersect at most with two other sets $\text{supp } \widehat{\theta}_{v-1}$ and $\text{supp } \widehat{\theta}_{v+1}$. $\square$

Remark 4. For any double sequence q of polynomials $q_{m,v}$, we have $Rq \equiv 0$.

Proof. The Fourier transform of the function $e^{2\pi i \delta_{m,v} \tau} q_{m,v}(\tau)$ is supported at the single point $\delta_{m,v}$, which does not get into $\text{supp } \widehat{\theta}_v$. Thus,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_{m,v}(\cdot, \tau) q_{m,v}(\tau) d\tau \equiv 0.$$

□

Also, the kernel of R satisfies a certain smoothness condition.

Lemma 5. *Fix some $m \in \mathcal{M}$. For any interval I with center x_0 , there exist an l^2 -valued function*

$$p_{m,I}(x, \tau) = \{p_{m,v,I}(x, \tau)\}_{v \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

such that $p_{m,I}(\cdot, \tau) \in \mathcal{P}_r(l^2)$ for any τ , $p_{m,v,I}(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}$ for any x , and

$$\left(\sum_{v \in \mathbb{Z}} |\rho_{m,v}(x, \tau) - p_{m,v,I}(x, \tau)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C_r |I|^r}{|\tau - x_0|^{r+1}} \quad (7)$$

for $\tau \notin 2I$ and $x \in I$.

Clearly, it is sufficient to prove this lemma for the functions $\theta_v(x - \tau)$ instead of $\rho_{m,v}(x, \tau)$. The corresponding proof can be found, for example, in [2]. Also we provide its sketch in the last section.

Let $h = \{h_{m,v}\}$ be an arbitrary l^2 -valued function such that $M_{i,2,s}h$ is finite at some point. We introduce a certain modification of R whose action on any such h is well defined. Namely, following Kislyakov and Kruglyak (see Section 4.4 of [3]), we consider some intervals $J_1 \subset J_2 \subset \dots$ whose union coincides with $\mathbb{R}$. The L^2 -boundedness of R , together with Lemmas 4 and 5, implies that on each interval J_α , we may construct the following l^2 -valued function:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\alpha,h}(x) &= R(\chi_{2J_\alpha} h)(x) \\ &+ \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 2J_\alpha} \sum_{v=-\infty}^{N_m} (\rho_{m,v}(x, \tau) - p_{m,v,J_\alpha}(x, \tau)) h_{m,v}(\tau) d\tau \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \\ &x \in J_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Repeating the arguments from Section 4.4 of [3], we can prove that each function $W_{\alpha+1,h}(x) - W_{\alpha,h}(x)$, $x \in J_\alpha$, is equal to some polynomial in $\mathcal{P}_r(l^2)$.

Thus, we can define the modification $\tilde{R}$ of the operator R as follows. We set $\tilde{R}h = W_{1,h}$ on J_1 . Next, we set $\tilde{R}h = W_{2,h} + P$ on J_2 , where P is polynomial in $\mathcal{P}_r(l^2)$ such that $P = W_{2,h} - W_{1,h}$ on J_1 . Further, we extend $\tilde{R}h$ to J_3 in the same way, and so on.

Remark 5. For any l^2 -valued polynomial q , we have $\tilde{R}q \in \mathcal{P}_r(l^2)$.

Proof. We can use the arguments similar to those in Section 4.4.1 of [3]. Namely, we introduce the functions

$$W_{\alpha,h}^\nu(x) = \left\{ \sum_{v=\nu}^{N_m} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_{m,v}(x, \tau) h_{m,v}(\tau) d\tau - \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 2J_\alpha} p_{m,v,J_\alpha}(x, \tau) h_{m,v}(\tau) d\tau \right) \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \quad x \in J_\alpha. \quad (8)$$

It is easy to see that $W_{\alpha,h}^\nu \rightarrow W_{\alpha,h}$ in $L^2(J_\alpha, l^2)$ as $\nu \rightarrow -\infty$. Let h be our polynomial q . Then since $W_{\alpha,q}^\nu$ are polynomials (by Remark 4), the function $W_{\alpha,q}$ is a polynomial itself. $\square$

Lemma 5, together with Remarks 3 and 5, implies the following proposition, which can be proved in the same way as Theorem 4.21 in Section 4.4.1 of [3].

Lemma 6. *Let h be a measurable l^2 -valued function such that $M_{i,2,s}h$ is finite at some point. Then*

$$M_{r,2,s}(\tilde{R}h) \leq CM_{i,2,s}h.$$

Suppose

$$h = \{\Phi_{m,v} * g_{m,v}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}, v=-\infty \dots N_m}. \quad (9)$$

Lemma 6 allows us to reduce Theorem 2 to the estimate $M_{r,2,s}h \leq CM_{i,2,s}f$. Indeed, suppose this estimate is fulfilled. By Remark 1, we can choose a collection P of polynomials in $\mathcal{P}_r$ such that $\tilde{h} = h - P$ is a function in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(l^2)$. By Lemma 5, we obtain $M_{r,2,s}(\tilde{R}\tilde{h}) \leq CM_{r,2,s}h$ (here we put $i = r$). On the other hand, we have

$$\tilde{R}\tilde{h} = W_{\alpha,\tilde{h}} + P_\alpha = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow -\infty} (W_{\alpha,\tilde{h}}^\nu + P_\alpha^\nu) \quad \text{on each } J_\alpha,$$

where the functions $W_{\alpha,\tilde{h}}^\nu$ are defined by (8), P_α are polynomials (l^2 -valued) such that the functions $W_{\alpha,\tilde{h}} + P_\alpha$ agree on different J_α , the polynomials P_α^ν

are chosen by the same principle for $W_{\alpha, \tilde{h}}^\nu$, and the limits is taken in $L^2(J_\alpha, l^2)$. By identity (6) and Remark 4, we have

$$W_{\alpha, \tilde{h}}^\nu(x) + P_\alpha^\nu(x) = \left\{ e^{-2\pi i a_m x} (\widehat{f} \psi_{m, \nu}^1)^\vee(x) - p_{m, \nu}^1(x) \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}},$$

where $p_{m, \nu}^1$ are some polynomials that do not depend on α . So we reduce our theorem to the estimate $M_{r, 2, s} h \leq C M_{i, 2, s} f$ where h is defined by (9).

4 Conclusion of the proof

First, we get rid of the functions $\Phi_{m, v}$. For this purpose, we introduce the simple operator Φ :

$$\Phi(\{g_{m, v}\}) = \{\Phi_{m, v} * g_{m, v}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}, v = -\infty \dots N_m}.$$

By Remark 1 and Lemma 4, the operator Φ is well defined for any sequence of measurable functions $g = \{g_{m, v}\}$, provided $M_{i, 2, s} g$ is finite at some point. The Plancherel theorem immediately implies that Φ is L^2 -bounded. Also it is clear that if P is a sequence of polynomials in $\mathcal{P}_i$, then each element of ΦP is also a polynomial in $\mathcal{P}_i$. Finally, we may state the following smoothness condition for the kernel of Φ .

Lemma 7. *Fix some $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $v = -\infty \dots N_m$. Then for any interval I with center τ_0 , there exist a function $p_{m, v, I}(\tau, t)$ such that $p_{m, v, I}(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{P}_r$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $p_{m, v, I}(\tau, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}$ for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, and*

$$|\Phi_{m, v}(\tau - t) - p_{m, v, I}(\tau, t)| \leq \frac{C_r |I|^r}{|t - \tau_0|^{r+1}} \quad \text{for } t \notin 2I \quad \text{and } \tau \in I.$$

Here the constant C_r does not depend on m or v .

The proof of this lemma is trivial. However it will be presented in the last section. Lemma 7, together with L^2 -boundedness of Φ and the fact that Φ transforms polynomials into polynomials, implies the following lemma, which can be proved in the same way as Theorem 4.21 in [3] (but without complications concerning the definition of the operator).

Lemma 8. *Let g be a sequence of measurable functions such that $M_{i, 2, s} g$ is finite at some point. Then*

$$M_{r, 2, s}(\Phi g) \leq C M_{i, 2, s} g.$$

So it remains to prove that for the functions $g_{m, v}$ defined by (5), we have

$$M_{r, 2, s}(\{g_{m, v}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}, v = -\infty \dots N_m}) \leq C M_{i, 2, s} f. \quad (10)$$

Rubio de Francia's operators. We split each sequence $\{-\infty, \dots, N_m\}$ into 100 subsequences $\mathcal{V}_m^d$ (here $d = 1 \dots 100$) in the following way: v gets into $\mathcal{V}_m^d$ if the residue of $N_m - v$ modulo 100 equals d . The following remark is almost obvious.

Remark 6. Each collection $\{J_{k_m, v, j_m, v}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}, v \in \mathcal{V}_m^d}$, $d = 1 \dots 100$, consists of pairwise disjoint intervals, provided A is sufficiently close to 1. Besides, these intervals do not contain the origin.

Now let $\mathcal{A}$ be any subset of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $\{J_{k,j}\}_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{A}}$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint intervals that do not contain the origin. Consider the operator H defined by the formula

$$Hf(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \kappa(t, y) f(y) dy$$

where

$$\kappa(t, y) = \{\kappa_{k,j}(t, y)\}_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{A}} = \{\phi_k(t - y)e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y}\}_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{A}}.$$

Such operators were first considered by Rubio de Francia in [5]. We prove the following lemma, which, together with Remark 6, immediately implies estimate (10).

Lemma 9. *Let f be a measurable function such that $M_{i,2,s}f$ is finite at some point. Then we have*

$$M_{r,2,s}(Hf) \leq CM_{i,2,s}f.$$

As usual, first we study the behavior of H in L^2 and on polynomials.

Remark 7. The operator H is L^2 -bounded.

Proof. We have

$$j2^k + \text{supp } \widehat{\phi}_k \subset J_{k,j},$$

and the collection $\{J_{k,j}\}_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{A}}$ consists of pairwise disjoint intervals. But by the Plancherel theorem, all this implies the L^2 -boundedness of H . $\square$

Remark 8. We have $Hq \equiv 0$ for any polynomial q .

Proof. The Fourier transform of the function $e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y} q(y)$ is supported at the single point $-j2^k$. But from the fact that $0 \notin J_{k,j}$ for $(k, j) \in \mathcal{A}$, it follows immediately that $-j2^k \notin \text{supp } \widehat{\phi}_k$ and, therefore, $Hq \equiv 0$. $\square$

The kernel $\kappa(t, y)$ satisfies the following smoothness condition.

Lemma 10. *For any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, there exists an l^2 -valued function*

$$q_I(t, y) = \{q_{k,j,I}(t, y)\}_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{A}}$$

such that $q_I(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{P}_r(l^2)$ for any y , $q_{k,j,I}(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}$ for any t , and the following relation is fulfilled: for any $\xi \in l^2$, any $t \in I$, and any $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\left(\int_{I_\sigma} |\langle \kappa(t, y) - q_I(t, y), \xi \rangle_{l^2}|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \leq C 2^{-\sigma B_r} |I|^{-1/2} \|\xi\|_{l^2}, \quad (11)$$

where $I_\sigma = 2^{\sigma+1}I \setminus 2^\sigma I$ and $B_r = r + 1/2$.

Very similar estimates can be found in [2, 4, 5]. However the exponent B_r was never calculated precisely. Since we need its exact value, we provide the proof of Lemma 10 in the last section.

Now we have all the components to prove Lemma 9. Our proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.21 in [3], but slightly more complicated due to complexity of condition (11).

Proof of Lemma 9. Consider a point y_0 such that $\mu = \widetilde{M}_{i,2,s}(f)(y_0)$ is a finite number (we recall that $\widetilde{M}_{i,2,s}$ is defined by (3)). Then for any interval I with center y_0 , we have

$$\frac{1}{|I|^s} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \mu,$$

where $f_I = \mathfrak{P}_I f$.

Let P_I be a sequence of polynomials in $\mathcal{P}_r$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} Hf(t) - P_I(t) \\ = H(\chi_{2I}(f - f_I))(t) + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 2I} (\kappa(t, y) - q_I(t, y))(f(y) - f_I(y)) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

If we verify the estimate

$$\frac{1}{|I|^s} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |Hf - P_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C\mu,$$

then we will prove Lemma 9.

First, we present some propositions from the book [3]. The following simple lemma can be found early in it.

Lemma 11. For any two cubes $Q \subset Q_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and any polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$, we have

$$\|p\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} \leq C \left(\frac{|Q_1|}{|Q|} \right)^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |p|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where a constant C depends only on i and n .

The properties of $\mathfrak{P}_I$ imply the following estimate (which also can be found in [3]).

Remark 9. For any interval I , we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f_{2I} - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \left(\frac{1}{|2I|} \int_{2I} |f - f_{2I}|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f_{2I} - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} &= \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |\mathfrak{P}_I(f - f_{2I})|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f - f_{2I}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C' \left(\frac{1}{|2I|} \int_{2I} |f - f_{2I}|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we consider the first summand in the right-hand side of (12). Using the L^2 -boundedness of the operator H , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |H(\chi_{2I}(f - f_I))|_{l^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_{2I} |f - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_{2I} |f - f_{2I}|^2 \right)^{1/2} + C' \|f_{2I} - f_I\|_{L^\infty(2I)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 11 and Remark 9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{2I} - f_I\|_{L^\infty(2I)} &\leq C 2^i \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f_{2I} - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C' \left(\frac{1}{|2I|} \int_{2I} |f - f_{2I}|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequality with the previous one, we come to the following estimate:

$$\frac{1}{|I|^s} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |H(\chi_{2I}(f - f_I))|_{l^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C\mu.$$

It remains to treat the second summand in (12). We set

$$W(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 2I} (\kappa(t, y) - q_I(t, y)) (f(y) - f_I(y)) dy.$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |W|_{l^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= |I|^{-1/2} \sup_{u: \|u\| \leq 1} \left| \int_I \langle u(t), W(t) \rangle_{l^2} dt \right| \\ &\leq |I|^{-1/2} \sup_{u: \|u\| \leq 1} \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 2I} |f(y) - f_I(y)| |\langle u(t), \kappa(t, y) - q_I(t, y) \rangle_{l^2}| dy dt, \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken over the unit ball in $L^2(I, l^2)$. By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain that the last expression is not greater than

$$\begin{aligned} & |I|^{-1/2} \sup_{u: \|u\| \leq 1} \sum_{\sigma=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{I_\sigma} |f(y) - f_I(y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \\ & \quad \times \int_I \left(\int_{I_\sigma} |\langle u(t), \kappa(t, y) - q_I(t, y) \rangle_{l^2}|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 10 implies that the second multiplier in each summand can be estimated by

$$C 2^{-\sigma(1/2+r)} |I|^{-1/2} \int_I |u(t)|_{l^2} dt \leq C' 2^{-\sigma(1/2+r)}.$$

Therefore, we must estimate the following expression:

$$|I|^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(1/2+r)} \left(\int_{I_\sigma} |f - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{2^{\sigma+1}I} |f - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\int_{2^{\sigma+1}I} |f - f_{2^{\sigma+1}I}|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\sigma} |2^{\sigma+1}I|^{1/2} \|f_{2^{\alpha+1}I} - f_{2^{\alpha}I}\|_{L^\infty(2^{\sigma+1}I)}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 11 and Remark 9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{2^{\alpha+1}I} - f_{2^{\alpha}I}\|_{L^\infty(2^{\sigma+1}I)} & \leq C \left(\frac{|2^{\sigma+1}I|}{|2^{\alpha}I|} \right)^{i-1} \left(\frac{1}{|2^{\alpha}I|} \int_{2^{\alpha}I} |f_{2^{\alpha+1}I} - f_{2^{\alpha}I}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C' 2^{(\sigma-\alpha)(i-1)} \left(\frac{1}{|2^{\alpha+1}I|} \int_{2^{\alpha+1}I} |f - f_{2^{\alpha+1}I}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C' 2^{(\sigma-\alpha)(i-1)} |2^{\alpha+1}I|^s \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the last expression into the previous estimate, we get

$$\left(\int_{I_\sigma} |f - f_I|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C |2^{\sigma+1}I|^{1/2} |I|^s \mu 2^{\sigma(i-1)} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\sigma} 2^{\alpha(s-i+1)}.$$

Finally, we have

$$\frac{1}{|I|^s} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |W|_{l^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \mu \sum_{\sigma=1}^{\infty} \left(2^{-\sigma(r-i+1)} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\sigma} 2^{\alpha(s-i+1)} \right).$$

The sum over α is dominated by a constant if $s-i+1 < 0$, by σ if $s-i+1 = 0$, and by $C 2^{\sigma(s-i+1)}$ if $s-i+1 > 0$. Since $r > \max\{s, i-1\}$, we see that the series in σ is convergent in any case, and we are done.

5 Smoothness conditions

In this chapter we prove Lemmas 5, 7, and 10.

The proof of Lemma 5. Such estimates are widely known, and the corresponding proof can be found, for example, in [2]. Here we provide its sketch.

Let $P_{u,v}$ be the Taylor polynomial of θ_v at the point u of degree $r - 1$. Put $p_{v,I}(x, \tau) = P_{x_0-\tau,v}(x - \tau)$. Since $\theta \in \mathcal{S}$, it is easily shown that

$$|\theta_v(x - \tau) - p_{v,I}(x, \tau)| \leq C_{r,\beta} A^{v(r+1)} |x - x_0|^r (1 + A^v |\tau - x_0|)^{-\beta},$$

$$\beta = 1, 2, \dots$$

Letting $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = r + 2$, we obtain

$$|\theta_v(x - \tau) - p_{v,I}(x, \tau)| \leq C_r A^{v(r+1)} |I|^r, \quad (13)$$

$$|\theta_v(x - \tau) - p_{v,I}(x, \tau)| \leq C_r A^{-v} \frac{|I|^r}{|\tau - x_0|^{r+2}}. \quad (14)$$

Estimate (13) is better than (14) exactly when $A^v < \frac{1}{|\tau - x_0|}$. We set $p_{m,v,I}(x, \tau) = e^{2\pi i \delta_{m,v} \tau} p_{v,I}(x, \tau)$ and split the sum in (7) into two: the first over all v such that $A^v < \frac{1}{|\tau - x_0|}$ and the second over all remaining v . Using (13) for the summands in the first part and (14) for the rest, we obtain (7).

The proof of Lemma 7. Let $P_{u,m,v}$ be the Taylor polynomial of $\Phi_{m,v}$ at the point u of degree $r - 1$. We recall that $\Phi_{m,v}(t) = e^{-2\pi i \delta_{m,v} t} \varphi_m(t)$ and $\varphi_m(t) = l_m \varphi(l_m t)$, where φ is a certain function in $\mathcal{S}$. Put $p_{m,v,I}(\tau, t) = P_{\tau_0-t,m,v}(\tau - t)$. Then we have

$$|\Phi_{m,v}(\tau - t) - p_{m,v,I}(\tau, t)| \leq C_r \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha, \alpha' \leq r \\ \alpha + \alpha' = r}} |\tau - \tau_0|^r \delta_{m,v}^\alpha |\varphi_m^{(\alpha')}(\eta)|,$$

where η lies between $\tau - t$ and $\tau_0 - t$. Since $|\tau - t| \asymp |\tau_0 - t|$, we obtain

$$|\tau - \tau_0|^r \delta_{m,v}^\alpha |\varphi_m^{(\alpha')}(\eta)| \leq C_{r,\beta} |\tau - \tau_0|^r \delta_{m,v}^\alpha l_m^{\alpha'+1} (1 + l_m |t - \tau_0|)^{-\beta},$$

$$\beta = 1, 2, \dots$$

Note that $\delta_{m,v} \leq l_m$. Thus, letting $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = r + 2$, we have

$$|\Phi_{m,v}(\tau - t) - p_{m,v,I}(\tau, t)| \leq C_r l_m^{r+1} |I|^r,$$

$$|\Phi_{m,v}(\tau - t) - p_{m,v,I}(\tau, t)| \leq \frac{C_r |I|^r}{l_m |t - \tau_0|^{r+2}}.$$

Using the first inequality if $l_m < \frac{1}{|t - \tau_0|}$ and the second otherwise, we come to the estimate desired.

The proof of Lemma 10. Similar estimates and their proofs can be found in [2, 4, 5]. For completeness, we repeat the proof here. Besides, we calculate B_r .

As we will see, estimate (11) can be proved for any set $\mathcal{A}$ of pairs (k, j) and does not depend on it. So we suppose the set $\mathcal{A}$ coincides with the whole $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

We define the polynomials $p_{k,I}(t, y)$ for the functions ϕ_k the same way as we defined $p_{v,I}$ for θ_v . Estimates (13) and (14) are fulfilled for ϕ_k and $p_{k,I}$ when $A = 2$. We define the function $q_I(t, y)$ by the formula

$$q_I(t, y) = \{q_{k,j,I}(t, y)\}_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{A}} = \{p_{k,I}(t, y)e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y}\}_{(k,j) \in \mathcal{A}}.$$

Also we put

$$\gamma_{k,\sigma} = \sup_{y \in I_\sigma, t \in I} |\phi_k(t - y) - p_{k,I}(t, y)|.$$

In this notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{I_\sigma} |\langle \kappa(t, y) - q_I(t, y), \xi \rangle|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\int_{I_\sigma} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\phi_k(t - y) - p_{k,I}(t, y)| \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_{k,j} e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y} \right| \right)^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \sum_k \gamma_{k,\sigma} \left(\int_{I_\sigma} \left| \sum_j \xi_{k,j} e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y} \right|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_k \gamma_{k,\sigma} \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_k \gamma_{k,\sigma} \int_{I_\sigma} \left| \sum_j \xi_{k,j} e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y} \right|^2 dy \right)^{1/2}; \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

here we have used the triangle inequality in L^2 and the Cauchy inequality for sums.

Next, by (13) and (14), we obtain

$$\gamma_{k,\sigma} \leq C_r 2^{k(r+1)} |I|^r, \quad \gamma_{k,\sigma} \leq C_r 2^{-k} |I|^{-2} 2^{-(r+2)\sigma}. \tag{16}$$

The second estimate is stronger than the first exactly when $2^k \geq |I|^{-1} 2^{-\sigma}$. Splitting the sum $\sum \gamma_{k,\sigma}$ into two corresponding parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \gamma_{k,\sigma} & \leq C_r \left(\sum_{k: 2^k < |I|^{-1} 2^{-\sigma}} 2^{k(r+1)} |I|^r + \sum_{k: 2^k \geq |I|^{-1} 2^{-\sigma}} 2^{-k} |I|^{-2} 2^{-(r+2)\sigma} \right) \\ & \leq C'_r 2^{-\sigma(r+1)} |I|^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

It remains to estimate the second factor in the last expression in (15). Making the substitution $\tilde{y} = 2^k y$ and using the Riesz–Fischer theorem, we have

$$\int_{2^{\sigma+1}I} \left| \sum_j \xi_{k,j} e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y} \right|^2 dy \leq \begin{cases} C 2^{\sigma+1} |I| \sum_j |\xi_{k,j}|^2, & 2^{\sigma+1}|I| \geq 2^{-k}; \\ 2^{-k} \sum_j |\xi_{k,j}|^2, & 2^{\sigma+1}|I| < 2^{-k}. \end{cases}$$

By these estimates and inequalities (16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k \gamma_{k,\sigma} \int_{I_\sigma} \left| \sum_j \xi_{k,j} e^{-2\pi i j 2^k y} \right|^2 dy \\ & \leq C |\xi|_{l^2}^2 \left(\sum_{k: 2^k < |I|^{-1} 2^{-\sigma-1}} \gamma_{k,\sigma} 2^{-k} + \sum_{k: 2^k \geq |I|^{-1} 2^{-\sigma-1}} \gamma_{k,\sigma} 2^{\sigma+1} |I| \right) \\ & \leq C_r |\xi|_{l^2}^2 \left(\sum_{k: 2^k < |I|^{-1} 2^{-\sigma-1}} 2^{kr} |I|^r + \sum_{k: 2^k \geq |I|^{-1} 2^{-\sigma-1}} 2^{-k} 2^{-(r+1)\sigma+1} |I|^{-1} \right) \\ & \leq C'_r |\xi|_{l^2}^2 2^{-r\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (17), we conclude the proof.

References

- [1] J. Bourgain, *On square functions on the trigonometric system*, Bull. Soc. Math. Belg., Vol. 37, No. 1, 1985, 20–26
- [2] S. V. Kislyakov, *Littlewood–Paley theorem for arbitrary intervals: weighted estimates*, J. of Math. Sci., Vol. 156, No. 5, 2009, 824–833
- [3] Sergey Kislyakov and Natan Kruglyak, *Extremal Problems in Interpolation Theory, Whitney-Besicovitch Coverings, and Singular Integrals*, Monografie Matematyczne, Instytut Matematyczny PAN, Vol. 74 (New Series), Birkhäuser
- [4] S. V. Kislyakov and D. V. Parilov, *On the Littlewood–Paley theorem for arbitrary intervals*, J. of Math. Sci., Vol. 139, No. 2, 2006, 6417–6424
- [5] José L. Rubio de Francia, *A Littlewood–Paley inequality for arbitrary intervals*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamer., Vol. 1, No. 2, 1985, 1–14
- [6] Elias M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1993